

James R. Condo (#005867)
Kristine L. Gallardo (#033975)
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
Telephone: (602) 382.6000
Facsimile: (602) 382.6070
jcondo@swlaw.com
kgallardo@swlaw.com

Richard B. North, Jr. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Georgia Bar No. 545599
Matthew B. Lerner (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Georgia Bar No. 446986
NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP
201 17th Street, NW / Suite 1700
Atlanta, GA 30363
Telephone: (404) 322-6000
Telephone: (404) 322-6050
richard.north@nelsonmullins.com
matthew.lerner@nelsonmullins.com

Attorneys for Defendants
C. R. Bard, Inc. and
Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

IN RE: Bard IVC Filters Products Liability
Litigation,

This Document Relates to:

Debra Tinlin, et al. v. C. R. Bard, Inc., et al.
CV-16-00263-PHX-DGC

No. 2:15-MD-02641-DGC

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN
LIMINE NO. 6: SOCIAL
SECURITY DISABILITY
BENEFITS WHICH ARE
BARRED BY WISCONSIN'S
COLLATERAL SOURCE RULE**

(Assigned to the Honorable David G.
Campbell)

(Oral Argument Requested)

1 The plaintiffs argue that testimony and evidence about Mrs. Tinlin’s “social
2 security disability benefits or applications to obtain such benefits” are barred by
3 Wisconsin’s collateral source rule. But Bard does not intend to offer evidence of Mrs.
4 Tinlin’s disability to show that she received benefits from a collateral source as
5 compensation for any part of her alleged losses, or to offset/reduce any potential damages
6 award. Rather, Mrs. Tinlin has various physical limitations that have nothing to do with
7 the Recovery Filter, and the jury should be able to hear evidence that puts these
8 limitations into context to prevent the jury from assuming or inferring that her disability is
9 related to the filter. Thus, the plaintiffs’ motion should be denied.

10 The Wisconsin Supreme Court has summarized the collateral source rule as
11 “help[ing] claimants recover ‘reasonable value of the medical services rendered, without
12 limitation to the amounts paid.’” *Leitinger v. DBart, Inc.*, 736 N.W.2d 1, 8 (Wis. 2007)
13 (quoting *Lagerstrom v. Myrtle Werth Hosp.*, 700 N.W.2d 201, 215-16 (Wis. 2005)).
14 Wisconsin’s collateral source rule “denies a tortfeasor credit for payments or benefits
15 conferred upon the plaintiff by any person other than the tortfeasor.” *Id.* As such, an
16 award of damages cannot be limited or reduced by a collateral source payment. *Id.*
17 Likewise, the collateral source rule precludes introduction of evidence about benefits a
18 plaintiff has obtained from a collateral source. *Id.*

19 None of the evidence that Bard seeks to introduce, or that the plaintiffs identified in
20 their Motion, concerns payment or benefits that Mrs. Tinlin received because of her
21 disability, however. Rather, when Mrs. Tinlin suffers from a neurological disorder, has
22 undergone numerous open surgeries, alleges permanent debilitating pain and suffering
23 because of those surgeries, and has apparent physical limitations, including being
24 wheelchair bound, the jury should be able to hear evidence that most, if not all, of these
25 physical limitations are due to reasons other than the Recovery Filter. This evidence
26 includes the fact that Mrs. Tinlin was adjudicated as disabled before she received a
27 Recovery Filter. This evidence includes the fact that her neurologist thought that
28 Mrs. Tinlin’s deep venous thrombosis with pulmonary emboli (the very reason that

Mrs. Tinlin needed an IVC filter) combined with her neurological condition were such serious medical conditions that she believed Mrs. Tinlin to be permanently disabled and unable to work as a result. And this evidence includes the fact that before any alleged fracture of the Recovery Filter, Mrs. Tinlin's neurologist thought that Mrs. Tinlin was permanently disabled, physically unable to work, and physically never would be able to work again. Bard believes that this type of evidence is not only relevant, but in fact essential to putting Mrs. Tinlin's current physician condition and any damages into context, and to prevent the jury from assuming or inferring that her disability is related to the filter.

For these reasons, Bard respectfully requests that the Court deny the Motion.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 12th day of April, 2019.

s/ Richard B. North, Jr.
 Richard B. North, Jr.
 Georgia Bar No. 545599
 Matthew B. Lerner
 Georgia Bar No. 446986
 NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP
 Atlantic Station
 201 17th Street, NW / Suite 1700
 Atlanta, GA 30363
 PH: (404) 322-6000
 FX: (404) 322-6050
 richard.north@nelsonmullins.com
 matthew.lerner@nelsonmullins.com

James R. Condo (#005867)
 Kristine L. Gallardo (#033975)
 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
 One Arizona Center
 400 E. Van Buren
 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2204
 PH: (602) 382-6000
 jcondo@swlaw.com
 kgallardo@swlaw.com

**Attorneys for Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and
 Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.**